

REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 31, 34 and 37-39 are amended. Claims 7 and 41-43 are cancelled. Claims 154-160 are added. Claims 1-6, 8-40, 44 and 154-160 are in the application.

The specification is amended to correct typographical errors and oversights. Entry of the same and withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to specification informalities are requested.

Independent claim 1 stands rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,556,476 to Lei et al. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the recess comprises a recess base, with the outer peripheral sidewall of the recess connecting with and extending perpendicularly from the recess base. Such does not occur in Lei et al. Specifically, Lei et al. only discloses a circumferential purge channel 220 which clearly displaces and separates its recess base or floor 26 from its outer peripheral sidewall defined by hoop 282. Accordingly, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites something which is not found within the Lei et al. patent, and the anticipation rejection thereof should be withdrawn. Action to that end is requested.

Further, it would not be obvious to modify the structure disclosed by Lei et al. to read upon Applicant's claim 1 as doing so would defeat the fundamental purpose of Lei et al. to provide a peripheral purge gas flow 286 which is intended to preclude precursor access to the peripheral sidewalls of a substrate received by the device. Applicant's amended claim 1 should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Claim 8 stands rejected as being anticipated by the Lei et al. patent. Claim 8 has been rewritten into independent form and to recite that all of the recess outer peripheral sidewall extends perpendicularly relative to the recess base. Such does not occur in Lei et al. Specifically, the Lei et al. figures show, and col.13, Ins.60+ disclose, that the upper inner edge of hoop 282 is angled back. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Lei et al. does not disclose that all of the recess outer peripheral sidewall extends perpendicularly relative to the recess base as Lei et al. only discloses that an upper portion thereof is angled from perpendicular. Accordingly, Applicant's claim 8 should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Applicant's claim 31 stands rejected as being obvious over Lei et al. Applicant's claim 31 has been amended to be in independent form and yet to not require the limitation of claim 30. Claim 31 recites that the recess outer peripheral sidewall has an elevational length which is less than the thickness of a substrate for which the susceptor is designed. Lei et al., in Figs. 7A and 7B, clearly only discloses a recess outer peripheral sidewall elevational length which is greater than or equal to a substrate for which a susceptor is designed, not less than as Applicant recites in claim 31. It would not be obvious to modify that which Lei et al. specifically teaches to read upon Applicant's amended claim 31 as doing so would likely lead to exposure of the peripheral outer edge of the substrate to precursor gases, which would clearly defeat the primary objective of the Lei et al. teaching. Accordingly, an obviousness rejection of claim 31 would be improper.

Further, the Patent Office already ruled in this application in the Office Action of March 10, 2006 that reference to combined elevational length which is equal to or at least as great as the thickness of a substrate for which the susceptor is designed constitutes a patentably distinct species relative to eight other species, and inherently relative to claiming a combined elevational length which is less than the thickness of a substrate for which the susceptor is designed, and which Applicant included in at least one of its claims as-filed. Accordingly, Applicant's claim 31 should be allowed, and action to that end is requested.

Claim 34 has been rewritten into independent form. Such should be allowed at least for the same essential reasons asserted above with respect to the allowability of claim 31.

Added independent claim 155 recites that the radially inner sidewall is flat. Such is clearly supported from Applicant's application as-filed in reviewing Figs. 3 and 4 in combination. Clearly, surface 52 of projection 48 in Fig. 3 is shown as being flat, and not curved. On the other hand, Lei et al. clearly only discloses that its radially inner sidewall 230 is curved at col.13, Ins.24+ as being a "generally arcuate surface". Accordingly, Applicant's independent claim 155 recites something which is neither shown nor suggested by Lei et al., and should be allowed. Action to that end is requested.

Applicant's added independent claim 156 recites that no portion of the radially inner sidewall of the projections is received radially inward of the

outer peripheral sidewall of the recess. Clearly, Lei et al. only everywhere discloses that the lower portion of its radially inner sidewall is required to be received radially inward of its outer peripheral sidewall of the recess defined by hoop 282. Accordingly, Applicant's claim 156 recites something which is neither shown nor suggested by Lee et al., and should be allowed. Action to that end is requested.

Original withdrawn claims 33, 36, 38 and 39 are rewritten into independent form as claims 157, 158, 159 and 160 for completeness herein. Such are not mere matters of design choice relative to Lei et al. essentially as asserted above. Also by admission of the Examiner, attributes associated with combined elevational length of a recess outer peripheral sidewall and radially inner sidewall of a projection constitute independently and separate patentably distinct species in the Office Action of March 10, 2006.

Applicant's dependent claims should be allowed as depending from allowable base claims, and for their own recited features which are neither shown nor suggested in the cited art. Action to that end is requested.

This application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance,
and action to that end is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9-7-06

By: 

Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268